DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1. This is in reply to communication filed on 05/08/2012.

2. Claims 25-32 remain cancelled.

3. Claims 37 and 38 have been amended.

4. Claims 1-24 and 33-38 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1- 24 and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention. The applicant's amendment filed on

10/31/2012 contains the limitation "wherein the converting the source inventory

location information into the intermediate format comprises: determining whether an

intermediate record exists, wherein the intermediate record is associated with the

source inventory location information, if the intermediate record exists, accessing a

common object, wherein the common object is associated with the intermediate

record, if the intermediate record does not exists, creating the intermediate record and

the common object, the common object" is considered new matter since it does not

have any support in the specification.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness
        or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims

was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point

out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the

time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35

U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. **Claims 1-24 and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

   Coleman (US 5,708,828) in view of Balgeman (US 5,446,880), and further in view of

   Katz (US 2002/0178077).

8. <u>Regarding Claims 1-3, 9-11, 33, and 35:</u> Coleman discloses a computer implemented

   method comprising:

- synchronizing existing target information with source information, wherein the existing

   target information is stored in a target location record at a target system, the source

   information is stored at a plurality of source systems, the plurality of source systems are

   ones of a plurality of computer systems, the target system is another of the plurality of

   computer systems, (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

The synchronizing comprises:

- extracting the source information from a plurality of source records (abstract, figs.2B, 3,

   C1 L9-13),

   o at least one of the plurality of source location records is extracted from a first

      source system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),

   o at least one of the plurality of source location records is extracted from a second

      source system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),

   o the source information from each of the plurality of source records is in one of a

      plurality of source formats, and each one of the plurality of source formats

corresponds to at least one of the plurality of source systems (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

- generating intermediate source location information by converting the source location information into an intermediate format (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

- converting the intermediate source information into target location information, wherein the target location information is in a target format, and the target format corresponds to the target system, (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

Coleman does not explicitly teach wherein converting the source inventory location information into the intermediate format comprises: determining whether an intermediate record exists, wherein the intermediate record is associated with the source inventory location information, if the intermediate record exists, accessing a common object, wherein the common object is associated with the intermediate record, if the intermediate record does not exists, creating the intermediate record and the common object, the common object, and mapping the source inventory location information to the common object.

However, Balgeman does disclose the following:

- o wherein the converting the source inventory location information into the intermediate format comprises:

- o determining whether an intermediate record exists, wherein the intermediate record is associated with the source inventory location information,

- if the intermediate record exists, accessing a common object, wherein the common object is associated with the intermediate record,

- if the intermediate record does not exists, creating the intermediate record and the common object, the common object, and mapping the source inventory location information to the common object (C8 L54-60, claims 3, 6, 7, & 9);

- and updating the target inventory location record using the target inventory location information (C8 L54-60, claims 3, 6, 7, & 9).

While, Katz does teaches inventory location information (¶¶ 39, 42).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Balgeman's and Katz's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry. Also, for the advantage of providing a communication system which provides flexibility by allowing individual nodes to utilize different databases and which automatically updates corresponding records at different databases with a minimum of burden on the users (Balgeman; C1 L66-67, C2 L1-2).

9. <u>Regarding Claims 4 and 12:</u> Coleman discloses a method of claim 1, wherein from the at least one of the plurality of source location records, the extracting extracts less than all first source location information, and from the at least one of the plurality of source

location records from the second source system, the extracting extracts less than all

second source location information (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

10. <u>Regarding Claims 6, 20, and 21:</u> Coleman discloses a method of claim 5, wherein each of

the plurality of address elements comprises: an address identifier element; an address

base data element, wherein the address data cleansing data element includes a disable

cleansing flag element; an address data cleansing data element; an address relationship

data element; and an address custom data element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

11. <u>Regarding Claims 7 and 22:</u> Coleman discloses a method of claim 6, wherein the address

relationship data element comprises: an address effective end date element; an address

occupancy type code element; an address effective start date element; an address type

code element; and an address list of roles element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

12. <u>Regarding Claims 5, 8, 13-19, and 23-24:</u> Coleman substantially discloses the claimed

invention. However, Coleman does not appear to explicitly teach hierarchy of data

elements includes a plurality of inventory location elements,

However, Katz disclose a method of claim 4, wherein the hierarchy of data

elements includes a plurality of inventory location elements, wherein each of the

plurality of inventory location elements includes: an identifier for identifying the

inventory location element; a base data element for defining: a location description; a

location name; and a location type code; a list of addresses element for defining a

plurality of address elements from a party class; a list of related business units elements

for defining a plurality of business units associated with the inventory, and wherein each

of the plurality of business units associated with the inventory includes an identifier

element; a list of related inventory locations for defining a plurality of related inventory

locations; and a custom data element for defining customized attributes for the

inventory (¶¶ 39, 42, 43, 46, 54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use Katz's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data

from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the

advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data

exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry.

13. Regarding Claims *34 & 36-38*: Coleman substantially discloses the claimed invention,

however Coleman does not explicitly teach determining whether a target inventory

location record exists at a target system, if the target location record exists at the target

system, updating the target location record with the target location information, if the

target location record does not exist at the target system, creating the target location

record at the target system and storing the target location information in the target

location record.

However, Balgeman does teach wherein the converting the source inventory location information into the intermediate format comprises: determining whether an intermediate record exists, wherein the intermediate record is associated with the source inventory location information, if the intermediate record exists, accessing a common object, wherein the common object is associated with the intermediate record, if the intermediate record does not exists, creating the intermediate record and the common object, the common object, and mapping the source inventory location information to the common object (C8 L54-60, claims 3, 6, 7, & 9);

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Balgeman's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, in order to minimize inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry. Also, for the advantage of providing a communication system which provides flexibility by allowing individual nodes to utilize different databases and which automatically updates corresponding records at different databases with a minimum of burden on the users (Balgeman; C1 L66-67, C2 L1-2).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular the applicant argues that: a) the cited references fail to disclose "wherein

converting the source inventory location information into the intermediate format

comprises: determining whether an intermediate record exists, wherein the

intermediate record is associated with the source inventory location information, if the

intermediate record exists, accessing a common object, wherein the common object is

associated with the intermediate record, if the intermediate record does not exists,

creating the intermediate record and the common object, the common object, and

mapping the source inventory location information to the common object.".

In response to a) examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that

claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Balgeman teaches that

subsequent updates of the record by any node are automatically distributed to the

other nodes by utilizing a standardized record format (C8 L54-57). Balgeman further

teaches automatically sending records stored in a first database that have been

modified to other nodes which contain corresponding records thereby keeping

corresponding records at other nodes updated (claim 6). Labeling each record at its

creation with a unique identification number which always identifies all corresponding

records in other nodes in the communication system (claim 7).

Therefore, the combination of the cited references still meet the scope of the

limitations as currently claimed.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as

set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to FAHD OBEID whose telephone number is (571)270-

3324. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fahd A Obeid/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3627
July 11, 2012